

To: Mathieus, George[gemathieus@mt.gov]
From: Laidlaw, Tina
Sent: Thur 3/20/2014 4:27:53 PM
Subject: RE: National Nutrient Picture -- comments in the email.

Within R8, here is the list of states interpreting the narrative for nutrients: UT (lakes/streams), MT, ND (lakes), SD (just starting with the 2014 Integrated Report), Wy (very limited- based on biological data). CO rarely lists based on the narrative but will list based on exceedances of DO and pH.

Nationally, EPA is in the process of synthesizing that information and tallying the number of states interpreting the narrative for nutrients. States I am aware of that use the narrative to identify nutrient-impaired waters include: CT, ME, MA, NH, NJ, DE, MD, PA, VA, WV, IL, IN, MI, OH, NM. Keep in mind that this tally is a very rough estimate from my notes. ☺

From: Mathieus, George [mailto:gemathieus@mt.gov]
Sent: Thursday, March 20, 2014 9:40 AM
To: Laidlaw, Tina
Subject: RE: National Nutrient Picture -- comments in the email.

Thanks, what about my other question....narrative vs numeric, interpretation, etc.

From: Laidlaw, Tina [mailto:Laidlaw.Tina@epa.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, March 19, 2014 3:28 PM
To: Suplee, Mike; Mathieus, George
Subject: National Nutrient Picture -- comments in the email.

The National Picture

- a. Phosphorus: 4 states with statewide criteria (HI, WI, FL, NJ) 10 with site-specific criteria

My count was 7 states with statewide criteria - (HI, WI, FL, NJ) plus Minnesota, RI, WV, Wisconsin. If you count CO, it's a total of 8. Lakes/ streams combined. No estuaries.

Plus 4 territories.

For site-specific criteria, I had 15 states with Site-specific TP criteria (combining lakes/ streams;

excluding estuarine criteria. States include: VT, MA, SC, AZ,CA,GA, IL, MO, NE,NV, NM, OK, OR, VA, and MT (Clark fork)

b. Nitrogen: 3 states with statewide criteria (HI, FL, VT), 6 with site-specific criteria

My count was the same. Plus 4 territories. For Site-specific criteria, I also had a total of 6 states -- AZ,CA,GA,MO,NE,NV.

c. Criteria established by the other states similar in concentration to the criteria being proposed for Montana

d. EPA continues to expect states to pursue nutrient abatement policies and regulations, including numeric nutrient criteria

George, in terms of upcoming state work on nutrient criteria, here is what I'm aware of:

Ohio is adopting some kind of nutrient indicator

Utah plans to adopt TN/TP criteria for Headwaters streams, hopefully initiating rulemaking in late 2014/ early 2015

I think New Hampshire and New York are also working on adopting nutrient criteria. Our EPA national website indicates that a number of states (MA, VT, PA, AL, DE) also hope to adopt criteria for possibly both lakes / streams for TN and TP in the next few years.

Also, the link to EPA's 2014 guidance on use of the narrative for nutrients can be found at:
<http://water.epa.gov/lawsregs/lawsguidance/cwa/tmdl/2014-memo.cfm#identifying>

Hope this helps.

Tina